

REMARKS

This paper is filed in response to the Decision on Appeal dated November 29, 2007. As indicated in the Decision, the rejection of claim 6 over Martin (U.S. Patent No. 1,892,259) has been overturned by the Appeals Board. The upheld rejection over Gardenier (U.S. Patent No. 6,182,303) does not include claim 6. Thus, claim 6 is believed to be allowable upon it being rewritten in independent form to include all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Accordingly, claim 1 has been rewritten to incorporate claims 5 and 6 therein and is believed to be allowable. Claim 24 has also been rewritten to incorporate the subject matter of claims 5 and 6 therein and this claim is also believed to be allowable. Claims 5 and 6 have been canceled.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that the application is in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested.

If a telephone conference would be of assistance in advancing prosecution of the subject application, Applicant's undersigned attorney invites the Examiner to telephone him at the number provided.

Respectfully submitted,



Victor A. Cardona, Esq.
Attorney for Appellant's
Reg. No. 44,589

Dated: January 29, 2008

HESLIN ROTHENBERG FARLEY & , P.C.

5 Columbia Circle
Albany, NY 12203-5160
Telephone: (518) 452-5600
Facsimile: (518) 452-5579